

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-19 are pending in the application; reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

1. Claims 2-9 and 11-18 were rejected as non-statutory double patenting over claims 2 and 10 of the grandparent issued patent USP 5,896,176.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18: A terminal disclaimer is enclosed.

2. Claims 10 and 19 were rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 10 and 19: The claims have been amended to include a memory.

3. Claims 2-19 were rejected as unpatentable over Wasserman.

Claims 2-10: Cited Wasserman col.10, ln.16-32 describes texture data which was not in the original frame that was compressed (by compressor 112); thus there is no suggestion of the base claim 2 requirement of circuitry for aggregation of the motion data and aggregation of texture data of the groups of pixels of the input digital video.

Claims 11-19: Cited Wasserman col.10, ln.16-32 describes processor 160 using texture data which is separate from the reconstructed video from decompressor 132, and decompressor 132 would be where symbol sequences are interpreted as motion data and texture data. However, there is no suggestion of the base claim 11 requirement of a decoder operable to interpret separate sequences of symbols as aggregated motion data and aggregated texture data.

Consequently, the claims are patentable over Wasserman.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carlton H. Hoel/

Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365